78-239

AUG 4 1973

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. _____

---

LOUIS SMITH,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

---

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OHIO

---

ALLEN BROWN
Fifth Floor
Barrister House
216 East Ninth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Attorney for Petitioner

COURT INDEX PRESS, INC. — 809 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 — (513) 241-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| OPINION BELOW | 1 |
| JURISDICTION | 2 |
| QUESTION PRESENTED | 2 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED | 3 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 3 |
| REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT | 5 |
| I. Whether the petitioner's constitutional protection against unreasonable search and seizure, under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, was violated when a police officer entered a four family dwelling unit, and thereafter entered petitioner's apartment, without a search warrant and without permission or consent for such entry and subsequent search, and without arrest of petitioner, commences to search petitioner and seizes a revolver on the person of the defendant. | 6 |
| CONCLUSION: | |
| For the reasons set forth above, certiorari should be granted | 9 |
| APPENDIX: | |
| Judgment of Common Pleas Court, Hamilton County, Ohio | 10 |
| Decision, Court of Appeals, First Appellate District of Ohio, Hamilton County, Ohio | 11 |

Page

Judgment Entry, Court of Appeals, First Appellate District of Ohio, Hamilton County, Ohio .... 14

Entry of Supreme Court of Ohio Dismissing Appeal ..... 16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Beck v. Ohio, 379 U.S. 89, 85 S. Ct. 223, 13 L. Ed. 2d 142 (1964) ..... 7

Brineger v. United States, 338 U.S. 160, 69 S. Ct. 1302, 1310 93 L. Ed. 1879 (1949) ..... 7

Rios v. United States, 364 U.S. 253, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1688, 80 S. Ct. 1431 (1960) ..... 8

Sibron v. State of New York, 392 U.S. 40, 63, 88 S. Ct. 1889, 20 L. Ed. 889 (1968) ..... 8

Terry v. State of Ohio, 392 U.S. 1, 88 S. Ct. 1868, 20 L. Ed. 2d 889 (1968) ..... 6, 9

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. _____

---

LOUIS SMITH,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

---

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OHIO

---

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the ruling of the Supreme Court of Ohio entered in the above entitled case on May 18, 1973 dismissing the appeal of petitioner from the judgment of the Common Pleas Court of Hamilton County, Ohio sentencing petitioner to one to three years in the Ohio State Penitentiary.

## OPINION BELOW

The judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio is unreported and printed herein as Appendix A. The entry and decision of the Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, Hamilton County, Ohio is unreported and printed herein as Appendices B and C.

The entry of the Supreme Court of Ohio dismissing the Appeal is unreported and printed herein as Appendix D.

## JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Common Pleas was dated and entered on April 21, 1972. The judgment was affirmed by the Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, Hamilton County, Ohio on February 5, 1973. The Supreme Court of Ohio dismissed the appeal for the reason that no substantial constitutional question existed on May 18, 1973. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C.A. section 1257 (3) and 2101, and Part V of the Rules of this Court.

## QUESTION PRESENTED

The Constitutional question presented by this Writ of Certiorari was raised at the earliest possible instance in the entire cause; was presented to the Court of Common Pleas in a separately heard Motion to Suppress and thereafter renewed during the merit trial; was argued on appeal to the First Appellate District of Ohio; was presented in a Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction to the Supreme Court of Ohio and is presented as follows:

(1) Whether the petitioner's constitutional protection against unreasonable search and seizure, under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, was violated when a police officer entered a four family dwelling unit and thereafter entered petitioner's apartment, without a search warrant and without permission or consent for such entry and subsequent search, and without arrest of petitioner, commenced to search petitioner and seized a revolver from the person of the defendant.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment IV, Constitution of the United States

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Section I, Amendment XIV, Constitution of the United States

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

* * *

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 21, 1971, at approximately 5:00 p.m., police responded solely to a radio dispatch in full as follows: "man with a gun 670 North Crescent" (States Exhibit 6). No evidence was ever offered as to the antecedents or basis of such radio call. A cruiser went to a street adjacent to North Crescent and stopped by a single residential building with single front and single back door, on the corner of North Crescent and said adjacent

street. They dismounted, went to the rear door and on the basis of hearing voices inside said building, entered the rear of the same without knocking or otherwise announcing their presence. Both officers had no prior knowledge of the content, number of dwellings, or any details of the interior of said building save that it was a residence in a Negro neighborhood. (R. 246). Having gained admittance they noted it was apparently a four apartment dwelling and proceeded to the second floor. On the landing of the second floor leading into the defendant's apartment the officers encountered petitioner Smith and his wife at the door of their apartment. In a polite conversation, both petitioner Smith and his wife, the only civilians present, indicated they had no knowledge of a complaint nor of anyone calling the police. One officer testified that at the conclusion of the conversation as the petitioner made a slight turn as if to turn back into his apartment the officer noticed an indefinable bulge in his coat. (R. 20, 236, 237). The position of the alleged and admittedly indefinable bulge changed location from under the left armpit in the preliminary examination, and earlier trial on assault on a police officer[1] to the side and kidney area in the trial (R. 14 ,15, 275). The second officer testified at no time did he see a bulge. (R. 336). The first officer then, without speaking, "grabbed for him" (petitioner Smith) in order to search him and what happened next is in conflict. Petitioner Smith, supported by his wife, says the officer pushed into his apartment, grabbed the petitioner, handcuffed him, searched him in several pockets and finally withdrew a gun from the back fowl pocket of the petitioner's hunting jacket. (p. 490-492). The officer, not fully supported by his fellow officer, said petitioner Smith coun-

[1] The petitioner was subsequently acquitted of the charge of assault on a policeman in the Municipal Court of Hamilton County, Ohio.

ter pushed him back down two steps, and after an altercation the officer finally subdued the petitioner, handcuffed him, conducted a search of his entire person and then recovered a hand pistol from the back fowl pocket of the petitioner's hunting jacket. The record indicates that the officer neither ordered nor requested the petitioner to submit to a search nor did he place petitioner under arrest before searching him. The hunting jacket was introduced into evidence. (Defense Exhibit A). The back fowl pocket is a commodius patch at bottom middle rear of the upper thigh length jacket, designed for the holding of slaughtered small game.

The case was tried to a jury after a motion to suppress evidence was overruled.

## REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This case presents a significant issue of constitutional law for this Court's review: entry, unannounced and uninvited, by police officers into a private dwelling on the basis of a radio call prompting investigation of an area and without arrest or search warrant, entry is made into a home and with only the presence of a possible bulge in a person's clothing, and without consent, that person is searched and a revolver is seized from which an arrest for carrying a concealed weapon is then made, is a question of constitutional magnitude for this Court's determination to govern future conduct of police officers under similar conditions.

## I.

**WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE, UNDER THE FOURTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, WAS VIOLATED WHEN A POLICE OFFICER ENTERED A FOUR FAMILY DWELLING UNIT, AND THEREAFTER ENTERED PETITIONER'S APARTMENT, WITHOUT A SEARCH WARRANT AND WITHOUT PERMISSION OR CONSENT FOR SUCH ENTRY AND SUBSEQUENT SEARCH, AND WITHOUT ARREST OF PETITIONER, COMMENCES TO SEARCH PETITIONER AND SEIZES A REVOLVER ON THE PERSON OF THE DEFENDANT.**

Probable cause is required to justify a warrantless search and seizure of an individual and petitioner contends the facts herein show substantially less than probable cause. In *Terry* v. *State of Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 88 S. Ct. 1868, 20 L. Ed. 2d. 889 (1968) this Court said that the requirement of probable cause remains "fully relevant" to police conduct in the context where swift action is predicated by on-the-spot observations. In order to justify his intrusion into the constitutionally protected rights of the petitioner the police officer "must be able to point to specific and articulable facts which, taken together with rational inferences from those facts, reasonable warrant that intrusion" *Terry* at p. 20, 21. Two policemen came to the house of the petitioner after a radio dispatch ("man with a gun")[1]

[1] Carrying a gun is in and of itself not a crime in Ohio. The sole restraints are O.R.C. 2931.01 forbidding possession of a concealed wea-

and after hearing voices in conversation, described by one officer as loud (R. 236) and by the other as normal conversation (R. 327, 331) entered a residence without knocking. Although it turned out after entry to be a four family, it was to them merely a residence. (R. 246). From this point on the "search" was constitutionally tainted. Other events further destructive of Fourth Amendment rights were to occur.

The officers then proceeded to the second floor where they encountered and had a polite conversation with the petitioner and his wife who both indicated they had no knowledge of any call to the police or any reason for a call to the police. There was no excitement or agitation, nor evidence of a crime, nor indication of probable cause whatsoever. Then as the petitioner was turning back into his own apartment at the conclusion of a non-rude, logical conversation, only one officer said he saw an indefinable bulge in the petitioner's clothing whereupon he physically grabbed the petitioner. He made no request or order concerning search or any form of oral inquiry or order whatsoever. He merely grabbed at the petitioner. Under *Beck* v. *Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89, 379 U.S. 89, 85 S. Ct. 223, 13 L. Ed. 2d 142 (1964) there were no facts available to the police that would warrant a man of reasonable caution to believe, that an offense had been committed. Indeed, after a reasonable and responsive conversation between petitioner Smith, his wife and the officers, the petitioner rather than constituting a threat, according to the officer's testimony, was stepping from the second floor entryway back into the interior of his own apartment. (R. pp. 236, 237). In dealing with probable cause, consideration is given to "factual and practical considerations of everyday

---

pon, O.R.C. 2923.04 forbidding possession of a machine gun without a permit, and O.R.C. 2923.011 forbidding possession of a weapon on an aircraft.

life on which reasonable and prudent men, not legal technicians act." *Brineger* v. *United States,* 338 U.S. 160, 69 S. Ct. 1302, 1310 93 L. Ed. 1879 (1949). The vague, non-criminal radio call and the questionable "bulge" in a hunting jacket are the only factual, practical considerations upon which the officer could act. These facts do not qualify as probabilities which a reasonable prudent man may use to determine probable cause, nor a threat which precluded ordinary courtesy, much less the overriding of constitutional rights.

Probable cause necessary to justify governmental intrusion into the petitioners privacy cannot be retroactively supplied by the evidence uncovered. *Rios* v. *United States,* 364 U.S. 253, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1688, 80 S. Ct. 1431 (1960). Where, as herein, no probable cause exists for an arrest, "it is axiomatic that an incident search may not precede an arrest and serve as part of its justification. *Sibron* v. *State of New York,* 392 U.S. 40, 63, 88 S. Ct. 1889 20 L. Ed. 889 (1968).

Respondent has argued below that the officer could act to protect himself. "The police officer is not entitled to seize and search every person whom he sees on the street or of whom he makes inquiries. Before he places a hand on the person of a citizen in search of anything he must have constitutionally adequate, reasonable grounds for doing so. In the case of a self protective search for weapons he must be able to *point to particular facts from which he reasonably inferred that the individual was armed and dangerous.* (Emphasis added). *Sibron* v. *State of New York, supra,* p. 64 citing *Terry* v. *Ohio, supra.* Neither officer, testified to any facts which indicate they suspected the petitioner to be armed and dangerous, nor anything in his conduct or demeanor which could even cause fear. Rather than acting in a manner to place the officers

in fear of physical danger petitioner in his own home had been a polite and responsive citizen and at the end of a conversation was merely turning to go back into the main portion of his home when the officer grabbed him.

It is submitted, therefore, that the search being without probable cause, and evidence obtained as a result thereof must be excluded as evidence against the petitioner.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEN BROWN
Attorney for Petitioner
Barrister House - Fifth Level
216 East Ninth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
621-6151

## APPENDIX A

THE STATE OF OHIO, HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CRIMINAL DIVISION

No. 98262

THE STATE OF OHIO
vs.
LOUIS SMITH

**INDICTMENT FOR: CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS**

**(Entered April 21, 1972)**

The Defendant herein having been convicted of Carrying Concealed Weapons was this day brought before this Court, and being represented by Allen Brown, his Counsel, who was present, and the Defendant being informed of the Verdict of the Jury, was inquired of if he had anything to say why Judgment should not be pronounced against him, and having nothing further to say than he hath already said,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED, by this Court, that the Defendant be imprisoned and confined in the Ohio State Penitentiary, at Columbus, Ohio, and kept at hard labor, but without any solitary confine-

ment for a period of not less than one (1) Year, not more than three (3) Years, and that he pay the Costs of this Prosecution for which Execution is awarded.

/s/ MORRISSEY, Judge

## APPENDIX B

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO

No. C-72156

STATE OF OHIO,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

vs.

LOUIS SMITH,
Defendant-Appellant.

### DECISION

(Filed February 5, 1973)

Messrs. Simon L. Leis, Jr., and William S. Payler for Plaintiff-Appellee, Mr. Allen Brown for Defendant-Appellant.

PER CURIAM.

This cause came on to be heard on questions of law, transcript of the docket and journal entries and original

papers from the Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County, transcript of the proceedings, assignments of error, briefs and arguments of counsel.

Appellant presents four assignments of error. Assignment one states that the trial court erred in refusing to suppress evidence obtained by a warrantless search of the defendant's person. An examination of the record discloses that the police had probable cause to arrest the defendant and that the search conducted was incident to that lawful arrest. See *Chimel* v. *California*, 395 U.S. 752; *Beck* v. *Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89; also *Terry* v. *Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1. Assignment one is without merit.

In assignment two it is claimed that the trial court erred in not allowing the defendant to introduce a transcript of a preliminary hearing and proof of his previous acquittal on a misdemeanor charge of assault and battery on a police officer for the purposes of impeachment. The record reveals that the appellant questioned the police officers at length as to certain claimed discrepancies between their testimony at trial and that given during a preliminary hearing. The entire record of the proceeding in a preliminary hearing is not admsisible in evidence at the trial of the offense following indictment. Therefore, assignment two is not well taken.

The claim is made in assignment three that the trial court erred in not allowing evidence of threats which would constitute circumstances justifying a prudent man in carrying a concealed weapon for the defense of his person. An examination of the record fails to support appellant's claim. The trial court properly excluded evidence of which the witnesses could not testify from their own knowledge. Assignment three is not well taken.

Assignment four states that the trial court verdict was erroneous because the greater weight of the evidence was that the defendant was at the time of carrying the weapon

engaged in a lawful calling and under such circumstance that would justify a prudent man in carrying such a weapon for the defense of his person. An examination of the record discloses ample probative evidence of each element of the crime charged. The jury verdict is supported by the record. Assignment four is not well taken.

It is, therefore, ordered by the Court that the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County be, and the same hereby is, affirmed.

HESS, P. J., YOUNG and SHANNON, JJ.

## APPENDIX C

COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO

NO. C-72156

Common Pleas Court
No. 98262

STATE OF OHIO,

Appellee,

vs.

LOUIS SMITH,

Appellant.

### JUDGMENT ENTRY

(Entered February 5, 1973)

This cause came on to be heard upon the appeal on questions of law, assignments of error, the record from the Common Pleas Court of Hamilton County, Ohio, the briefs and the arguments of counsel.

Upon consideration thereof, the Court finds that the assignments of error are not well taken for the reasons set forth in the Decision filed herein and made a part hereof.

It is, therefore, Ordered by the Court that the judgment of the Common Pleas Court of Hamilton County, Ohio, be, and the same hereby is, affirmed.

It is further Ordered that a mandate be sent to the Common Pleas Court of Hamilton County, Ohio, for execution upon this judgment.

Costs to be taxed in compliance with Rule 24, Appellate Rules.

And the Court being of the opinion that there were reasonable grounds for this appeal, allows no penalty.

It is further Ordered that a certified copy of this Judgment, with a copy of the Decision attached, shall constitute the mandate pursuant to Rule 27, Ohio Rules of Appellate Procedure.

To all of which the appellant, by his counsel, excepts.

## APPENDIX D

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OHIO
1973 TERM
To wit: May 18, 1973

No. 73-257

THE STATE OF OHIO,
City of Columbus.

STATE OF OHIO, Appellee,
vs.
LOUIS SMITH, Appellant.

**APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS**
for Hamilton County

This cause, here on appeal as of right from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, was heard in the manner prescribed by law, and, no motion to dismiss such appeal having been filed, the Court sua sponte dismisses the appeal for the reason that no substantial constitutional question exists herein.

It is further ordered that a copy of this entry be certified to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County for entry.

I, Thomas L. Startzman, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio, certify that the foregoing entry was correctly copied from the Journal of this Court.

Witness my hand and the seal of the Court
this .... day of ..... 19..
..... Clerk
..... Deputy

HIO

:e,

nt.

;

art of
anner
ppeal
e ap-
ques-

tified
ounty

art of
opied

Court
19..
Clerk
eputy

AUG 21 1973

In The

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1973

No. 73-239

LOUIS SMITH,
Defendant-Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,
Plaintiff-Respondent.

## REPLY BRIEF OF PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SIMON L. LEIS, JR.
Prosecuting Attorney
Hamilton County, Ohio

LEONARD KIRSCHNER
Ass't Prosecuting Attorney
Hamilton County, Ohio

420 Hamilton County Court House
Court & Main Sts.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Respondent

ALLEN BROWN
Attorney at Law
216 E. Ninth St.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Attorney for Defendant-Petitioner

COURT INDEX PRESS, INC. — 809 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 — (513) 241-1450

## INDEX


| | Page |
|---|---|
| OPINIONS BELOW | 1 |
| JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT | 1 |
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED | 2 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 2 |
| REASONS WHY THIS WRIT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED | 4 |
| ISSUE | 5 |
| ARGUMENT ON ISSUE | 5 |
| CONCLUSION | 10 |


## CITATIONS


| | |
|---|---|
| Terry v. State, 392 U.S. 1, 88 S. Ct. 1868, 20 L. Ed. 2d 889 | 7 |
| Adams v. Williams, 407 U.S. 143, 92 S. Ct. 1921, 32 L. Ed. 2d 612 | 6 |

In The

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

**OCTOBER TERM, 1973**

---

No. 73-239

---

LOUIS SMITH,
Defendant-Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF OHIO,
Plaintiff-Respondent.

---

## REPLY BRIEF OF PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

### OPINIONS BELOW

The Brief of the petitioner correctly cites the opinions and judgments below.

### JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Certiorari is from a judgment of the Supreme Court of State of Ohio, entered on or about May 18, 1973, in which the Supreme Court of Ohio denied the petitioner leave to appeal. It is the belief of the respondent, State of Ohio, that the petitioner's conviction under the laws of the State of Ohio was consistent with the United States Constitution and its Amendments thereto.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Is the petitioner's constitutional protection against unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth and Fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution violated when a police officer; who receives a radio run from his dispatcher to a specific address with the instructions that at the address a man with a gun will be found; and when the police officer observes a bulge in the man's coat and reaches toward the bulge the man pushes him down the steps and the police officer thereafter grabs for the defendant-petitioner and a scuffle ensues which starts in the hallway and goes into the apartment of the defendant and is finally concluded in the hallway, at which time the police officer finds the gun where the bulge was?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 21, 1971, at approximately 5 P.M., Cincinnati Police officers responded to a radio run "man with a gun at 710 N. Crescent Avenue". A cruiser responded to the side street that runs along the side of the apartment building located at 710 N. Crescent Avenue, near the rear of the building. One of the officers stated he heard loud noises inside the rear of the building. The officer and his partner entered the back door which lead to a hallway leading to all apartments in the building which door was not locked; went up the common stair case for all the apartments on the second floor, to the second floor where they heard the loud voices coming from. On the second floor hallway landing the first officer encountered the defendant and his wife. The officer asked if they had called the police and that he was responding to a radio run. The defendant and his wife said that they had not called the police and that the officer's services were not needed.

defendant turned toward his apartment door and officer observed a bulge under his coat. The officer bbed for the defendant and the defendant pushed the er down the steps in the hall. (R-237). The officer wered and grabbed at the defendant and had an alter- on with said defendant starting in the hallway outside defendant's apartment and thereafter going inside the ndant's apartment and back outside on the hall land-

The officer, after the defendant was subdued and dcuffed, patted down the defendant and from the de of his jacket recovered a loaded 32 caliber revolver a holster which he had previously observed as being ulge under the coat.

Defendant was arrested for Carrying a Concealed Fire- n, Assault and Battery, and Disorderly Conduct. The ault and Battery charge and the Disorderly Conduct rge were misdemeanors and were tried in the Municipal rt.

The case for Carrying a Concealed Firearm was bound r to the Grand Jury and the Grand Jury indicted defendant. The case was subsequently tried to a jury r a Motion to Suppress was overruled. The Motion Suppress was heard on April 14, 1972 and overruled. e jury found the defendant guilty as charged in the ictment on April 21, 1972. Defendant was sentenced a period of not less than one nor more than three rs in the Ohio Penitentiary as provided by law. A ely Notice of Appeal was filed to the Court of Appeals the First Appellate District and the Court of Appeals the First Appellate District of Ohio set bond for the endant-appellant pending the perfection of his appeal n the Common Pleas Court judgment. Defendant- ellant has been on bond ever since the setting of the nd by the Court of Appeals of the First Appellate Dis-

trict through stays of execution granted by other Ohio Courts and this Court.

The Court of Appeals of the First Appellate District after having the record filed and having briefs filed by both plaintiff and defendant and after hearing arguments of counsel issued its opinion and affirmed the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas of the State of Ohio. Defendant-petitioner thereafter filed a Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Ohio and the Supreme Court denied jurisdiction in this matter. Thereafter, defendant-appellant filed his Petition for Writ of Certiorari to this Court.

## REASONS WHY THIS WRIT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED

Counsel for the defendant-petitioner in his over-exuberance in his representation of the defendant-petitioner has put words into his statement of facts and his reasoning which are not supported by the evidence presented in the course of the trial. It is respectfully submitted in this case that there are no Constitutional issues involved and that the officer had a legal right to make a search for a weapon to protect his person as well as having more than a sufficient amount of probable cause under all the facts and circumstances as brought forth in the trial upon which to arrest the defendant in this case.

## ISSUE

**IS THE PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE UNDER THE FOURTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION VIOLATED WHEN A POLICE OFFICER, WHO RECEIVES A RADIO RUN FROM HIS DISPATCHER TO A SPECIFIC ADDRESS WITH THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT AT THE ADDRESS A MAN WITH A GUN WILL BE FOUND; AND WHEN THE POLICE OFFICER OBSERVES A BULGE IN THE MAN'S COAT AND REACHES TOWARD THE BULGE THE MAN PUSHES HIM DOWN THE STEPS AND THE POLICE OFFICER THEREAFTER GRABS FOR THE DEFENDANT-PETITIONER AND A SCUFFLE ENSUES WHICH STARTS IN THE HALLWAY AND GOES INTO THE APARTMENT OF THE DEFENDANT AND IS FINALLY CONCLUDED IN THE HALLWAY AT WHICH TIME THE POLICE OFFICER FINDS THE GUN WHERE THE BULGE WAS?**

## ARGUMENT ON ISSUE

With due respect to the generalized statements of counsel r the defendant-petitioner; many of the things which he ys are either a sloughing over of important relevant idence produced at the time of the trial; or, in some ses, are figments of counsel's imagination. This is pecially so where he says a polite conversation took place tween the parties.

It is our belief that the search and seizure of the weapon om the defendant-petitioner in these proceedings are

clearly permissible on either one of two grounds in respect to recent pronouncements of this Court.

In simple language, the police officers received from their radio station a broadcast to proceed to a certain address where there was a man with a gun. The officers proceeded to the address and went into a public hall leading to all apartments and there heard loud noises which can be inferred to be arguments coming from the upstairs landing. The officers proceeded through the common hallway used by all tenants to the top of the second floor landing where they came into contact with the defendant-petitioner and his wife. Defendant-petitioner indicated that he had not called the police and while the officer was still interrogating him the defendant turned to go toward his apartment. At the time that the defendant turned to go toward his apartment and at a point in which the investigation had not been completed the officer saw a bulge in the defendant's pocket which he assumed to be a weapon. The officer grabbed for the defendant and the defendant assaulted the officer, pushing him down the stairs as evidenced by the record. The officer then got up and grabbed at the defendant and an altercation ensued which started in the hallway and went into the defendant-petitioner's apartment and then back out into the hallway. When the officer finally was able to subdue the defendant he was able to go to that point in the defendant-petitioner's pocket and remove a loaded gun from the place where he had observed a bulge.

It is our belief that either under the authority of *Terry* v. *State*, as reported in 392 U.S. 1, 88 S. Ct. 1868, 20 L. Ed. 2d. 889 or in the case of *Adams* v. *Williams* as reported in 407 U.S. 143, 92 S. Ct. 1921, 32 L. Ed. 2d. 612, that the search by the officer and the removal of the weapon was valid.

In the case of *Terry* v. *State*, supra, at page 1883, of the U.S. Report edition, this Court stated:

> "Our evaluation of the proper balance that has to be struck in this type of case leads us to conclude that there must be a narrowly drawn authority to permit a reasonable search for weapons for the protection of the police officer, where he has reason to believe that he is dealing with an armed and dangerous individual, regardless of whether he has probable cause to arrest the individual for a crime. The officer need not be absolutely certain that the individual is armed; the issue is whether a reasonably prudent man in the circumstances would be warranted in the belief that his safety or that of others was in danger. Cf. Beck v. State of Ohio, 379 U.S. 89 at 91, 85 S. Ct. 223 at 226, 13 L. Ed. 2d 142 (1964); Brinegar v. United States, 338 U.S. 160 at 174 to 176, 69 S. Ct. 1302 at 1311, 93 L. Ed. 1879 (1949); Stacey v. Emery, 97 U.S. 642 at 645, 24 L. Ed. 1035 (1878)."

Now, lets take the specifics of the case currently before the Court. The officer had a police radio run to report to a certain address and at that address there was a man with a gun. The officer went into the public common hallway in the apartment building in question and he heard loud noises emanating from the second floor. The officer went to the second floor and defendant-petitioner stated that he had not called the police and abruptly turned to leave the officer going toward his apartment door when the officer saw a bulge in his pocket. When the officer endeavored to stop the defendant from leaving the defendant-petitioner pushed the officer down the stairs.

We respectfully submit that not only was there more than a sufficient amount of evidence upon which the officer reasonably had suspicions that the defendant was carrying the gun by virtue of all the surrounding circumstances and facts in light of what he knew at that particular time;

but, it is our humble opinion that this even goes to the fact of showing actually probable cause for making the arrest in question which was for Assault and Battery on the police officer, disorderly conduct and Carrying Concealed Weapons which latter charge is the only charge on appeal to this Court.

As this Court held in the case of *Adams* v. *Williams*, supra, at page 616 of the Law Edition Report, this Court stated:

> "In Terry this Court recognized that 'a police officer may in appropriate circumstances and in an appropriate manner approach a person for the purpose of investigating possible criminal behavior even though there is no probable cause to make an arrest.' 392 US, at 22, 20 L Ed 2d at 906. The Fourth Amendment does not require a policeman who lacks the precise level of information necessary for probable cause to arrest to simply shrug his shoulders and allow a crime to occur or a criminal to escape. On the contrary, Terry recognizes that it may be the essence of good police work to adopt an intermediate response. See id., at 23, 20 L. Ed 2d at 907. *A brief stop of a suspicious individual, in order to determine his identity or to maintain the status quo momentarily while obtaining more information, may be most reasonable in light of the facts known to the officer at the time.* Id., at 21-22, 20 L Ed 2d at 905, 906; see Gaines v. Craven, 448 F 2d 1236 (CA 9 1971); United States v. Unverzagt, 424 F 2d 396 (CA 8 1970).
>
> The Court recognized in Terry *that the policeman making a reasonable investigatory stop should not be denied the opportunity to protect himself from attack by a hostile suspect. 'When an officer is justified in believing that the individual whose suspicious be-*

*havior he is investigating at close range is armed and presently dangerous to the officer or to others,' he may conduct a limited protective search for concealed weapons.* Id., at 24, 20 L Ed 2d at 908." (Emphasis ours.)

Now applying the two cases in question as we indicated it is our opinion that not only did the officer have a right to search for a weapon based on the information received by him supported by facts which he actually saw and observed first hand corroborating some of the other information that he received; but, it is our belief that there was more than a sufficient amount of evidence upon which the officer had probable cause to make an arrest. First of all, as previously indicated, the officer received a radio run from the police radio to proceed to a certain address and on that premises there was a man with a gun. The officer entered into the public common hallway of the apartment building in question where he heard loud noises emanating from the second floor. The officer proceeded to the top of the second floor landing where he encountered the defendant-petitioner and his wife. The officer proceeded to start asking questions whereupon defendant-petitioner indicated that he had not called the police and abruptly turned to go toward his apartment. When the defendant-petitioner turned to go to the apartment the officer saw a bulge in his pocket. When the officer reached toward the defendant-petitioner, defendant-petitioner assaulted him by pushing him down the staircase. It is our humble opinion that not only was there sufficient grounds upon which the officer could make the search in question for the protection of himself and others based on the evidence and information that he had received and on what he had actually observed; but, in

our opinion there was more than a sufficient amount of evidence to constitute probable cause.

Secondly, when the defendant pushed the officer down the stairs (R-237) the arrest for Assault and Battery on the police officer was warranted and it has always been the law that an officer may pat down and search an accused for weapons when an arrest has been made.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that based on the record as presented in the course of the trial that there was not an unlawful search and seizure involved in this matter and that the officer had not only probable cause to make an arrest; but, he also had the right to protect himself and others by searching for the weapon in question which was found at exactly the spot where the bulge was indicated for the protection of himself and others in the immediate vicinity. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this case be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD KIRSCHNER
Ass't Prosecuting Attorney

420 Hamilton County Court House
Court & Main Sts.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Attorney for Plaintiff-Respondent.